arXiv:1411.5852v1 [math.PR] 21 Nov 2014

A Full Balance Sheet Two-modes Optimal Switching problem*

Boualem Djehiche‡ Ali Hamdi§

November 24, 2014

Abstract

We formulate and solve a finite horizon full balance sheet two-modes optimal switching problem related to trade-off strategies between expected profit and cost yields. Given the current mode, this model allows for either a switch to the other mode or termination of the project, and this happens for both sides of the balance sheet. A novelty in this model is that the related obstacles are nonlinear in the underlying yields, whereas, they are linear in the standard optimal switching problem. The optimal switching problem is formulated in terms of a system of Snell envelopes for the profit and cost yields which act as obstacles to each other. We prove existence of a continuous minimal solution of this system using an approximation scheme and fully characterize the optimal switching strategy.

Keywords: real options, backward SDEs, Snell envelope, stopping time, optimal switching, impulse control, balance sheet, merger and acquisition.

AMS Classification subjects: 60G40, 93E20, 62P20, 91B99.

*To appear in Stochastics.

†Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the anonymous referees for their insightful remarks that helped improve both the content and the presentation of the paper. The financial support from The Swedish Export Credit Corporation (SEK) is gratefully acknowledged.

‡Department of Mathematics, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, SE-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden. *E-mail: boualem@math.kth.se*

§Department of Mathematics, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, SE-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden. *E-mail: ali.hamdi@math.kth.se*

1 Introduction

Optimal switching can relate to many practical applications. One may think for example of the problem one faces when there are a number of profit generating companies or investment projects in a conglomerate, and one wishes to switch the resource allocation between them in order to maximize the expected profit yield, J, depending on the random performance of the companies. The functional J is the expectation of an integral over running profits (which can represent the profits per unit time in the different modes), minus the switching costs.

Consider the case where there is only one company, and the only two modes of switching are active (mode 1) and inactive (mode 2). Then the problem reduces to finding an optimal strategy for starting and stopping production in this company. This problem is commonly known as the starting and stopping problem and amounts to finding an optimal sequence of stopping times $\delta^* = \{\tau_n^*\}_{n\geq 1}$, at which a switch between the two modes is made, to maximize J.

This formulation of the starting and stopping problem is studied in [16], where the problem is completely solved in finite horizon when the driving process (e.g. price of some commodity) is adapted to the Brownian filtration. By the Dynamic Programming Principle, the problem is shown to be equivalent to the existence of a pair of adapted processes $\left(Y^1, Y^2\right)$, which satisfies a system of Snell envelopes of the form

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^1 = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\geq t} \mathbb{E}\big[&\text{Profit over } [t,\tau] \text{ given mode 1 at time } t \\ &\text{and switch to mode 2 at time } \tau\big] \\ Y_t^2 = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\geq t} \mathbb{E}\big[&\text{Profit over } [t,\tau] \text{ given mode 2 at time } t \\ &\text{and switch to mode 1 at time } \tau\big]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, Y_t^1 can be interpreted as the maximal expected profit given that at time t mode 1 is activated, and Y_t^2 can be interpreted as the same given that at time t mode 2 is activated. Furthermore, the existence of the pair $\left(Y^1, Y^2\right)$ gives the optimal strategy of the problem as a sequence of stopping times where a switch between the two modes is made.

This class of switching problems and various extensions to multiple modes has recently attracted a lot of interest. In the following non-exhaustive list of references [2, 25, 4, 3, 14, 1, 10, 9, 12, 18, 17, 20, 24, 27, 26, 30, 21, 35, 31, 34] the authors consider various aspects of the multiple modes switching problem, where only switching between the different modes is allowed until the

end of the time horizon. Roughly, the setting assumes only that the state process, including the switching costs, are general processes adapted to the Brownian filtration. The solution to the problem is found in a manner similar to [16], namely using systems of Snell envelopes and their connection to a system of RBSDEs with interconnected obstacles. The findings include existence, uniqueness, stability and numerics of the solution of these RBSDE, approximations of the optimal switching strategies as well as filtering and partial information. In [18] (see also the references therein), the authors consider the optimal switching problem with multiple modes under Knightian uncertainty and with recursive utilities. The setup is equivalent to the solution of a system of RBSDEs with interconnected generators and obstacles. When the state process is Markovian, it is shown that the associated vector of value functions provides a viscosity solution to a system of variational inequalities with interconnected generators and obstacles. Common to these papers is that the obstacles are linear in the underlying yields. Moreover, their structure point only to one direction i.e. they are either upper or lower barriers. An extension of the above mentioned switching mechanism to include e.g. abandonment, is discussed, in the two-modes case, in [8], where the finite horizon starting and stopping problem with risk of abandonment is studied. Abandonment here refers to the risk that the investment project may be abandoned or definitely closed, if it is found to be unprofitable. In that paper the yield of a strategy is also defined by means of a functional $J(\delta)$, with the addition of costs emerging from a possible abandonment of the project. The authors show that this formulation of the problem is also equivalent to the existence of a system of Snell envelopes $\left(Y^1, Y^2\right)$. Moreover, this system provides an optimal strategy δ^* by proving that if the system exists, it is unique. Furthermore, it holds that $Y_0^1 = J(\delta^*)$. Hence, one of the main results in [8] is the proof of existence and uniqueness of $\left(Y^1, Y^2\right)$. However, as it is noted in the article, the addition of the risk of abandonment makes it very difficult and highly nonlinear to find this strategy, though there are numerical methods of finding appropriate approximations. A further extension related to this paper is considered in [9]. Instead of only maximizing the expected profit yield with respect to a family of admissible stopping times, the optimal stopping problem is related to trade-off strategies between the expected profit yield (to be maximized) and the expected cost yield (to be minimized). Hence, the expected profit and cost yield processes will act as obstacles to each other. Moreover, the optimal stopping time is shown to be the first time that the two meet (minus termination costs). Like in the papers mentioned above, the connection of this system of Snell envelopes with a system of RBSDEs with interconnected obstacles is used to obtain both

a minimal and a maximal solution to the problem via appropriate approximation schemes. Moreover, counter-examples are provided to show that the system of RBSDEs does not have a unique solution.

2 Problem formulation

In this paper we study a two-modes optimal switching problem for the full balance sheet i.e. we take into account the trade-off strategies between expected profit and expected cost yields. It is a combination of ideas and techniques for the two-modes starting and stopping problem developed in [16] and [8], and optimal stopping involving the full balance sheet motivated by problems occurring in merger and acquisition operations introduced in [9]. This problem is a natural extension of [8] and [9] since it incorporates both the action of switching between modes and the action of terminating a project, if it is found to be unprofitable. For example, being in mode 1, one may want to switch to mode 2 at time t, if the expected profit yield, $Y^{+,1}$, in this mode falls below the maximum of the expected profit yield in mode 2, $Y^{+,2}$, minus a switching cost ℓ_1 from mode 1 to mode 2, and the expected cost yield in mode 1, $Y^{-,1}$ minus the cost a_1 incurred when exiting/terminating the production while in mode 1, i.e.

$$Y_t^{+,1} \leq (Y_t^{+,2} - \ell_1(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,1} - a_1(t)),$$

or, if the expected cost yield in mode 1, $Y^{-,1}$, rises above the minimum of the expected cost yield in mode 2, $Y^{-,2}$, plus the switching cost ℓ_1 from mode 1 to mode 2, and the expected profit yield in mode 1, $Y^{+,1}$ plus the benefit b_1 incurred when exiting/terminating the production while in mode 1, i.e.

$$Y_t^{-,1} \ \geq (Y_t^{-,2} + \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,1} + b_1(t)).$$

A similar switching criterion holds from mode 2 to mode 1. Hence, the problem formulation in this paper allows for two possible actions, on both sides of the balance sheet, given the current mode, a switch to the other mode or the termination of the project. A novelty in this model is that the related obstacles are nonlinear in the underlying yields, whereas they are linear in the standard optimal switching problem.

If $\mathcal{F}_t$ denotes the history of the production up to time t, and ψ_i^+ and ψ_i^- denote respectively the running profit and cost per unit time dt and ξ_i^+ and ξ_i^- are the profit and cost yields at the horizon T, while in mode $i = 1, 2$, the expected profit yield, while in mode 1, can be expressed in terms of a

Snell envelope as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^{+,1} &= \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \geq t} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^\tau \psi_1^+(s)ds + S_\tau^{+,1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} + \xi_1^+\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ S_\tau^{+,1} &= \left((Y_\tau^{+,2} - \ell_1(\tau)) \vee (Y_\tau^{-,1} - a_1(\tau)) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where, the supremum is taken over exit times from the production in mode 1. Hence, a plausible guess of an optimal switching strategy would be at the following random time

$$\tau_t^{+,1} = \inf\{s \geq t,\ Y_s^{+,1} = (Y_s^{+,2} - \ell_1(s)) \vee (Y_s^{-,1} - a_1(s))\} \wedge T, \tag{2.2}$$

in which case we would obtain

$$Y_t^{+,1} = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^{\tau_t^{+,1}} \psi_1^+(s)ds + S^{+,1}_{\tau_t^{+,1}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_t^{+,1}<T\}} + \xi_1^+\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_t^{+,1}=T\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right]. \tag{2.3}$$

Furthermore, the Snell envelope expression of the expected cost yield, while in mode 1, reads

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^{-,1} &= \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \geq t} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^\sigma \psi_1^-(s)ds + S_\sigma^{-,1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma<T\}} + \xi_1^-\mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma=T\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ S_\sigma^{-,1} &= \left((Y_\sigma^{-,2} + \ell_1(\sigma)) \wedge (Y_\sigma^{+,1} + b_1(\sigma)) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where, the infimum is taken over exit times from the production in mode 1. Again, for any $t \leq T$, the random time

$$\sigma_t^{-,1} = \inf\{s \geq t,\ Y_s^{-,1} = (Y_s^{-,2} + \ell_1(s)) \wedge (Y_s^{+,1} + b_1(s))\} \wedge T, \tag{2.5}$$

would be a plausible optimal switching time, in which case we would obtain

$$Y_t^{-,1} = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^{\sigma_t^{-,1}} \psi_1^-(s)ds + S^{-,1}_{\sigma_t^{-,1}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma_t^{-,1}<T\}} + \xi_1^-\mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma_t^{-,1}=T\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right]. \tag{2.6}$$

The expected profit and cost yields $Y^{+,2}$ and $Y^{-,2}$, when the production is in mode 2, satisfy a similar set of Snell envelopes. As above, the corresponding optimal switching times would then be

$$\tau_t^{+,2} = \inf\{s \geq t,\ Y_s^{+,2} = (Y_s^{+,1} - \ell_2(s)) \vee (Y_s^{-,2} - a_2(s))\} \wedge T, \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\sigma_t^{-,2} = \inf\{s \geq t,\ Y_s^{-,2} = (Y_s^{-,1} + \ell_2(s)) \wedge (Y_s^{+,2} + b_2(s))\} \wedge T. \tag{2.8}$$

Summing up, a full balance sheet switching problem amounts to establishing existence and uniqueness of the processes $\left(Y^{+,1}, Y^{-,1}, Y^{+,2}, Y^{-,2}\right)$ that satisfy the following system of Snell envelopes with interconnected obstacles:

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^{+,1} = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \geq t} \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^\tau \psi_1^+(s)ds + S_\tau^{+,1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} + \xi_1^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \Big], \\ Y_t^{+,2} = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \geq t} \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^\tau \psi_2^+(s)ds + S_\tau^{+,2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<T\}} + \xi_2^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \Big], \\ Y_t^{-,1} = \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \geq t} \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^\sigma \psi_1^-(s)ds + S_\sigma^{-,1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma<T\}} + \xi_1^- \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \Big], \\ Y_t^{-,2} = \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \geq t} \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^\sigma \psi_2^-(s)ds + S_\sigma^{-,2}\mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma<T\}} + \xi_2^- \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \Big], \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

where, the suprema and infima are taken over random times τ and σ and where the obstacles are defined as

$$\begin{cases} S_t^{+,1} = \Big(Y_t^{+,2} - \ell_1(t)\Big) \vee \Big(Y_t^{-,1} - a_1(t)\Big), \\ S_t^{+,2} = \Big(Y_t^{+,1} - \ell_2(t)\Big) \vee \Big(Y_t^{-,2} - a_2(t)\Big), \\ S_t^{-,1} = \Big(Y_t^{-,2} + \ell_1(t)\Big) \wedge \Big(Y_t^{+,1} + b_1(t)\Big), \\ S_t^{-,2} = \Big(Y_t^{-,1} + \ell_2(t)\Big) \wedge \Big(Y_t^{+,2} + b_2(t)\Big). \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

In this paper we show existence of a solution of the system of Snell envelopes (2.9) and also prove that the random times displayed in (2.2), (2.5), (2.7), and (2.8) are optimal, when the history $(\mathcal{F}_t,\ 0 \leq t \leq T)$ of the production is generated by the filtration of a given Brownian motion B. Hence, using the relation between Snell envelopes and reflected BSDEs, this amounts to proving existence and continuity in time (needed to obtain optimality of the random times given above) of solutions of the following system of RBSDEs with interconnected obstacles: Find processes

$\left(Y^{\pm,i}, Z^{\pm,i}, K^{\pm,i}\right)$, $i = 1, 2$, in some appropriate spaces, such that

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^{+,i} = \xi_i^+ + \int_t^T \psi_i^+(s)ds + (K_T^{+,i} - K_t^{+,i}) - \int_t^T Z_s^{+,i} dB_s, \\ Y_t^{-,i} = \xi_i^- + \int_t^T \psi_i^-(s)ds - (K_T^{-,i} - K_t^{-,i}) - \int_t^T Z_s^{-,i} dB_s, \\ Y_t^{+,1} \geq (Y_t^{+,2} - \ell_1(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,1} - a_1(t)), \\ Y_t^{-,1} \leq (Y_t^{-,2} + \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,1} + b_1(t)), \\ Y_t^{+,2} \geq (Y_t^{+,1} - \ell_2(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,2} - a_2(t)), \\ Y_t^{-,2} \leq (Y_t^{-,1} + \ell_2(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,2} + b_2(t)), \\ \int_0^T [Y_t^{+,1} - (Y_t^{+,2} - \ell_1(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,1} - a_1(t))] dK_t^{+,1} = 0, \\ \int_0^T [(Y_t^{-,2} + \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,1} + b_1(t)) - Y_t^{-,1}] dK_t^{-,1} = 0, \\ \int_0^T [Y_t^{+,2} - (Y_t^{+,1} - \ell_2(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,2} - a_2(t))] dK_t^{+,2} = 0, \\ \int_0^T [(Y_t^{-,1} + \ell_2(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,2} + b_2(t)) - Y_s^{-,2}] dK_t^{-,2} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

The main result of this paper is existence of a minimal solution to the system (2.11) when the drivers ψ_i^+ and ψ_i^- take the form $\psi_i^+(t) = \psi_i^+(t, \omega, Y_t^{+,i}, Z_t^{+,i})$ and $\psi_i^-(t) = \psi_i^-(t, \omega, Y_t^{-,i}, Z_t^{-,i})$. A maximal solution may be proven to exist in an analogous way. Furthermore, we provide a counter-example showing that uniqueness of the solutions does not hold. The proof of the main result uses a monotone sequence of processes approximating the system $\left(Y^{+,1}, Y^{-,1}, Y^{+,2}, Y^{-,2}\right)$. The main estimates used to derive convergence of this approximating sequence make use of the Itô-Tanaka formula, which makes it difficult to extend the problem formulation to a multi-mode setting. Extension to the multiple-mode case does not seem impossible, but technically very challenging. By imposing some restrictions on some of the switching costs (they need to be Itô-processes), we obtain continuity in time of the solutions. If this restrictions are not made, then a càdlàg solution can still be proven to exist. However, the continuity is important to show optimality of the strategies $(\tau^{+,1}, \sigma^{-,1}, \tau^{+,2}, \sigma^{-,2})$ defined in (2.2), (2.5), (2.7) and (2.8) above.

When the drivers $\psi_i^\pm$ depend explicitly of a diffusion process with infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{A}$, unique solutions of systems of RBSDEs are related to viscosity solutions of systems of variational inequalities (see [13] for details). Unfortunately, we are unable to establish this relation due to lack of uniqueness of the solutions of the system of RBSDEs (2.11).

An extension of this model which includes a "mean-field" type interaction, prepared several months after the present paper, has appeared in [11], while this paper was still under review. To minimize eventual repetition, we will refer to [11] whenever similar arguments and proof are called upon.

The paper is organized in the following way. Section 3 gives the necessary notation and preliminaries. In Section 4, we introduce the system of RBSDEs associated with the problem, state the main result and give a counter-example showing lack of of uniqueness of the solutions of the system of RBSDEs. Finally, a proof of the main result is displayed in Section 5.

3 Notation and preliminaries

Throughout this paper $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ will be a fixed probability space on which is defined a standard d-dimensional Brownian motion $B = (B_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ whose natural filtration is $(\mathcal{F}_t^0 := \sigma\{B_s, s \leq t\})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$. Let $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ be the completed filtration of $(\mathcal{F}_t^0)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ with the $\mathbb{P}$-null sets of $\mathcal{F}$. Hence $\mathbb{F}$ satisfies the usual conditions, i.e. it is right continuous and complete.

We introduce the following spaces of processes:

- $\mathcal{P}$ is the σ-algebra on $[0,T] \times \Omega$ of $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes;
- $\mathcal{M}^{d,2}$ is the set of $\mathcal{P}$-measurable and $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued processes $w = (w_t)_{t \leq T}$ such that
$$\|w\|_{\mathcal{M}^{d,2}} := \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T |w_s|^2 ds\right]^{1/2} < \infty;$$
- $\mathcal{S}^2$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_c^2$) is the set of $\mathcal{P}$-measurable and càdlàg (resp. continuous), $\mathbb{R}$-valued processes $w = (w_t)_{t \leq T}$ such that
$$\|w\|_{\mathcal{S}^2} := \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |w_t|^2\right]^{1/2} < \infty;$$
- $\mathcal{K}^2$ (resp. $\mathcal{K}_c^2$) is a subset of $\mathcal{S}^2$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_c^2$) of nondecreasing càdlàg (resp. continuous) processes $(K_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ such that $K_0 = 0$.

In the sequel we will frequently use the following results on reflected BSDEs which are by now well known. For a proof, the reader is referred to e.g. [13] for the continuous case and to [15] or [23] for the càdlàg case. A solution of the reflected BSDE associated with a triple (f, ξ, S), where $f : (t, \omega, y, z) \mapsto f(t, \omega, y, z)$ ($\mathbb{R}$-valued) is the generator, ξ is the terminal condition and $S := (S_t)_{t \leq T}$ is the lower barrier, is a triple $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$

of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted stochastic processes that satisfies:

$$\begin{cases} Y \in \mathcal{S}^2,\ K \in \mathcal{K}^2 \text{ and } Z \in \mathcal{M}^{d,2}, \\ Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s,\omega,Y_s,Z_s)ds + (K_T - K_t) - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s, \\ Y_t \geq S_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ \int_0^T (S_{t^-} - Y_{t^-})dK_t = 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

The RBSDE(f,ξ,S) is said standard if the following conditions are satisfied:

(H1) The generator f is Lipschitz with respect to (y,z) uniformly in (t,ω) ;

(H2) The process $(f(t,\omega,0,0))_{0\leq t\leq T}$ is $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable and $dt\otimes d\mathbb{P}$-square integrable ;

(H3) The random variable ξ is in $L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_T,\mathbb{P})$;

(H4) The barrier S is càdlàg , $\mathbb{F}$-adapted and satisfies: $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|S_s^+|^2] < \infty$ and $S_T \leq \xi$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

Theorem 3.1. (see [15] or [23]) Let the coefficients (f,ξ,S) satisfy assumptions (**(H1)-(H4)**. Then the RBSDE (3.1) associated with (f,ξ,S) has a unique $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable solution (Y,Z,K) which belongs to $\mathcal{S}^2\times\mathcal{M}^{d,2}\times\mathcal{K}^2$. Moreover the process Y enjoys the following representation property as a Snell envelope: for all $t\leq T$,

$$Y_t = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\geq t}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^\tau f(s,Y_s,Z_s)ds + S_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{[\tau<T]\}} + \xi\mathbf{1}_{\{[\tau=T]\}}\middle|\mathcal{F}_t\right]. \tag{3.2}$$

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is related to the following, by now standard, estimates and comparison results for RBSDEs. For the proof see [13] for the continuous case and [15] or [23] for the càdlàg case.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (Y,Z,K) be a solution of the RBSDE (f,ξ,S). Then there exists a constant C depending only on the time horizon T and on the Lipschitz constant of f such that:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|Y_t|^2 + \int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds + |K_T|^2\right) \\ &\quad\leq C\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^T |f(s,0,0)|^2 ds + |\xi|^2 + \sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|S_t^+|^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Lemma 3.2. (*Comparison Theorem*) *Assume that* (Y, Z, K) *and* (Y', Z', K') *are solutions of the reflected BSDEs associated with* (f, ξ, S) *and* (f', ξ', S') *respectively, where only one of the two generators* f *or* f' *is assumed to be Lipschitz continuous. If*

- $\xi \leq \xi'$, $\mathbb{P}-$a.s. ,
- $f(t, y, z) \leq f'(t, y, z)$, $d\mathbb{P} \otimes dt$*-a.s. and for all* (y, z),
- $\mathbb{P}-$a.s. *for all* $\quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad S_t \leq S'_t$,

then

$$\mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad Y_t \leq Y'_t. \tag{3.4}$$

We finish this section by introducing a key ingredient in our problem, namely the notion of Snell envelope and some of its properties. We refer to [5], Appendix D in [22] or [15] for further details.

In what follows we let $\mathcal{T}_\theta$ denote the class of $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times τ such that $\tau \geq \theta$, for some $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time θ.

Lemma 3.3. *Let* $U = (U_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ *be an* $\mathbb{F}$*-adapted* $\mathbb{R}$*-valued càdlàg process that belongs to the class [D]; i.e. the set of random variables* $\{U_\tau, \ \tau \in \mathcal{T}_0\}$ *is uniformly integrable. Then, there exists an* $\mathbb{F}$*-adapted* $\mathbb{R}$*-valued càdlàg process* $Z := (Z_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ *such that* Z *is the smallest supermartingale which dominates* U*; i.e. if* $(\bar{Z}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ *is another càdlàg supermartingale of class [D] such that for all* $0 \leq t \leq T$, $\bar{Z}_t \geq U_t$, *then* $\bar{Z}_t \geq Z_t$ *for any* $0 \leq t \leq T$. *The process* Z *is called the Snell envelope of* U. *Moreover, it enjoys the following properties:*

(i) *For any* $\mathbb{F}$*-stopping time* θ *we have*

$$Z_\theta = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\theta} \mathbb{E}[U_\tau | \mathcal{F}_\theta] \quad (\text{and then } Z_T = U_T). \tag{3.5}$$

(ii) *The Doob-Meyer decomposition of* Z *implies the existence of a martingale* $(M_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ *and two nondecreasing processes* $(A_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ *and* $(B_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ *which are, respectively, continuous and purely discontinuous predictable such that for all* $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$Z_t = M_t - A_t - B_t \quad (\text{with } A_0 = B_0 = 0).$$

Moreover, for any $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\{\Delta B_t > 0\} \subset \{\Delta U_t < 0\} \cap \{Z_{t-} = U_{t-}\}. \tag{3.6}$$

(iii) *If U has only positive jumps, then Z is a continuous process. Furthermore, if θ is an $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time and $\tau_\theta^* = \inf\{s \geq \theta, Z_s = U_s\} \wedge T$, then τ_θ^* is optimal after θ, i.e.,*

$$Z_\theta = \mathbb{E}[Z_{\tau_\theta^*}|\mathcal{F}_\theta] = \mathbb{E}[U_{\tau_\theta^*}|\mathcal{F}_\theta] = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \geq \theta} \mathbb{E}[U_\tau|\mathcal{F}_\theta]. \tag{3.7}$$

4 A related system of reflected BSDEs

Consider the following system of reflected BSDEs, for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{cases} \left(Y^{\pm,i}, Z^{\pm,i}, K^{\pm,i}\right) \in \mathcal{S}_c^2 \times \mathcal{M}^{d,2} \times \mathcal{K}_c^2, \ \ i = 1, 2, \\ Y_t^{+,i} = \xi_i^+ + \displaystyle\int_t^T \psi_i^+(s, \omega, Y_s^{+,i}, Z_s^{+,i})ds + (K_T^{+,i} - K_t^{+,i}) - \int_t^T Z_s^{+,i} dB_s, \\ Y_t^{-,i} = \xi_i^- + \displaystyle\int_t^T \psi_i^-(s, \omega, Y_s^{-,i}, Z_s^{-,i})ds - (K_T^{-,i} - K_t^{-,i}) - \int_t^T Z_s^{-,i} dB_s, \\ Y_t^{+,1} \ \geq (Y_t^{+,2} - \ell_1(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,1} - a_1(t)), \\ Y_t^{-,1} \ \leq (Y_t^{-,2} + \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,1} + b_1(t)), \\ Y_t^{+,2} \ \geq (Y_t^{+,1} - \ell_2(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,2} - a_2(t)), \\ Y_t^{-,2} \ \leq (Y_t^{-,1} + \ell_2(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,2} + b_2(t)), \\ \int_0^T [Y_t^{+,1} - (Y_t^{+,2} - \ell_1(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,1} - a_1(t))] dK_t^{+,1} = 0, \\ \int_0^T [(Y_t^{-,2} + \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,1} + b_1(t)) - Y_t^{-,1}] dK_t^{-,1} = 0, \\ \int_0^T [Y_t^{+,2} - (Y_t^{+,1} - \ell_2(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,2} - a_2(t))] dK_t^{+,2} = 0, \\ \int_0^T [(Y_t^{-,1} + \ell_2(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,2} + b_2(t)) - Y_s^{-,2}] dK_t^{-,2} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Assumptions A

(A1) For each $i =, 1, 2$, $\psi_i^\pm$ are Lipschitz in (y, z) uniformly in (t, ω) meaning that there exists $C > 0$ such that, for any $(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$,

$$|\psi_i^\pm(t, \omega, y, z) - \psi_i^\pm(t, \omega, y', z')| \leq C(|y - y'| + |z - z'|).$$

Moreover, the processes $\psi_i^{\pm,0}(t) := \psi_i^\pm(t, \omega, 0, 0)$ are $\mathcal{F}$-progressively measurable and $dt \otimes d\mathbb{P}$-square integrable ;

(A2) The processes $(a_i(t, \omega))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, $b_i(t, \omega))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ and $(\ell_i(t, \omega))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, belong to $\mathcal{S}_c^2$. Moreover, $\ell_i(t) > 0$ almost surely;

(A3) The random variables $\xi_i^{\pm}$ are $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable and square integrable. Furthermore, we assume that $\mathbb{P}-$a.s.

$$\begin{cases} \xi_1^+ \ \geq (\xi_2^+ - \ell_1(T)) \vee (\xi_1^- - a_1(T)), \\ \xi_2^+ \ \geq (\xi_1^+ - \ell_2(T)) \vee (\xi_2^- - a_2(T)), \\ \xi_1^- \ \leq (\xi_2^- + \ell_1(T)) \wedge (\xi_1^+ + b_1(T)), \\ \xi_2^- \ \leq (\xi_1^- + \ell_2(T)) \wedge (\xi_2^+ + b_2(T)). \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

(A4) The processes $(b_i(t))_{0\leq t\leq T}$ and $(\ell_i(t,\omega))_{0\leq t\leq T}$, are of Itô type, i.e., for any $t \leq T$,

$$b_i(t) = b_i(0) + \int_0^t U_i(s)ds + \int_0^t V_i(s)dB_s, \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\ell_i(t) = \ell_i(0) + \int_0^t \bar{U}_i(s)ds + \int_0^t \bar{V}_i(s)dB_s, \tag{4.4}$$

for some $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes $(U, \bar{U})$ and $(V, \bar{V})$ which are $dt \otimes \mathbb{P}$-square integrable.

Remark 4.1. (1) *The set of solutions of system of inequalities (4.2) is nonempty. Indeed,* $\xi_i^+ = \xi_i^- = 1, i = 1, 2$ *satisfy (4.2), for*

$$\ell_i(T) = e^{-4T} \quad \textit{and} \quad a_i(T) = b_i(T) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

(2) *Noting that while* $Y_t^{+,i}$ *is a supermartingale,* $Y_t^{-,i}$ *is a submartingale, we need Assumptions* **(A4)** *to prove the continuity of the increasing process* $K^{-,i}$*. This in turn is used to derive the continuity of* $Y^{-,i}$ *and then of the process* $Y^{+,i}$*.*

We state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 4.1. *Under Assumptions* **A**, *the system of BSDEs (4.1) admits a minimal solution* $\left(Y^{\pm,i}, Z^{\pm,i}, K^{\pm,i}\right) \in \mathcal{S}_c^2 \times \mathcal{M}^{d,2} \times \mathcal{K}_c^2, \ i = 1, 2$*, in the sense that if* $\left(\bar{Y}^{\pm,i}, \bar{Z}^{\pm,i}, \bar{K}^{\pm,i}\right) \in \mathcal{S}_c^2 \times \mathcal{M}^{d,2} \times \mathcal{K}_c^2, \ i = 1, 2$ *is another solution of the system (4.1), then it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.} \ , \ \bar{Y}^{\pm,i} \geq Y^{\pm,i}, \ i = 1, 2.$$

Remark 4.2. *Under Assumptions* **A**, *if in (***A4***), instead of the process* $(b_i(t))_{0\leq t\leq T}$*, we assume that the process* $(a_i(t))_{0\leq t\leq T}$ *is of Itô type, then it can be shown that the system of BSDEs (4.1) admits a maximal solution.*

Remark 4.3. *Besides its mathematical importance, the notion of minimal (resp. maximal) solution enjoys the following interpretation from a management point of view: When operating between two modes, $Y_t^{+,i}$ and $Y_t^{-,i}$ constitute the minimal (resp. maximal) expected profit and cost, i.e. the expected balance sheet, which constitute the basis for any decision to perform eventual switching operations. Thus, the choice of the approximating schemes which lead to either minimal or maximal solutions is decisive. This interpretation is in line with the one related to the pricing of American options, where the Snell envelop corresponds to the minimal capital required to hedge the American option up to maturity.*

4.1 Non-uniqueness: a counter-example

The following counter-example, shows that the system (4.1) may not have a unique solution. Assume

$$\ell(t) := \ell_i(t) = e^{-4t} \quad \text{and} \quad a_i(t) = b_i(t) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2,\ 0 \le t \le T.$$

and take $\xi_i^+ = \xi_i^- = 1$, and

$$\begin{array}{l} \psi_1^+(t,\omega,y) = y, \ \ \psi_2^+(t,\omega,y) = y + \ell(t), \\ \psi_1^-(t,\omega,y) = 2y, \ \ \psi_2^-(t,\omega,y) = 2y + \ell(t),\ 0 \le t \le T. \end{array} \tag{4.5}$$

Then, it is easily checked that the following 'deterministic' processes

$$\begin{array}{l} Y_t^{+,1} = Y_t^{-,1} = e^{T-t}, \quad Y_t^{+,2} = Y_t^{-,2} = e^{T-t} + \frac{1}{3}\left(e^{-4t} - e^{-3T-t}\right), \\ Z_t^{+,i} = Z_t^{-,1} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ K_t^{+,1} = K_t^{+,2} = 0, \\ dK_t^{-,1} = e^{T-t}dt, \quad dK_t^{-,2} = \left[e^{T-t} + \frac{1}{3}\left(e^{-4t} - e^{-3T-t}\right)\right]dt. \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{l} Y_t^{+,1} = Y_t^{-,1} = e^{2(T-t)}, \quad Y_t^{+,2} = Y_t^{-,2} = e^{2(T-t)} + \frac{1}{2}\left(e^{-4t} - e^{-2(T+t)}\right), \\ Z_t^{+,i} = Z_t^{-,1} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ K_t^{-,1} = K_t^{-,2} = 0, \\ dK_t^{+,1} = e^{2(T-t)}dt, \quad dK_t^{+,2} = \left[e^{2(T-t)} + \frac{1}{2}\left(e^{-4t} - e^{-2(T+t)}\right)\right]dt \end{array}$$

are two different solutions of (4.1). Therefore, uniqueness may not hold for the system (4.1).

5 Proof of Theorem 4.1

The proof is performed in several steps. First, we construct two increasing approximation schemes $(Y^{+,i,n}, Z^{+,i,n}, K^{+,i,n})$ and $(Y^{-,i,n}, Z^{-,i,n}, K^{-,i,n})$ with appropriate properties that allow them to converge to a limit $(Y^{+,i}, Z^{+,i}, K^{+,i,})$ and $(Y^{-,i}, Z^{-,i}, K^{-,i})$ that solves (4.1). Then, we show that the positive measures $dK_t^{-,i,n}$ associated with the increasing processes $K_t^{-,i,n},\ 0 \leq t \leq T$ are absolutely continuous w.r.t. dt with square integrable densities. This will yield the continuity of the limit processes $Y^{-,i}$ of $Y^{-,i,n}$ as $n \to \infty$. Finally, applying the Doob-Meyer decomposition (see Lemma 3.3) to the Snell envelop representation of $Y^{+,i}$, we establish their continuity. Furthermore, we show that the limit processes $(Y^{+,i}, Z^{+,i}, K^{+,i,})$ and $(Y^{-,i}, Z^{-,i}, K^{-,i})$ constitute the minimal solution of (4.1). We will only account for the construction of the approximating sequences and their properties, the needed estimates and the absolute continuity of the increasing processes $dK^{-,i,n}$. The proofs of convergence to a continuous solution of (4.1) and the minimality of the solution of (4.1) are similar to the ones in the proof of Theorem 6 in [11], we therefore omit them.

Step 1. Construction of the approximating sequences and their properties

Let us introduce an increasing approximation schemes $(Y^{+,i,n}, Z^{+,i,n}, K^{+,i,n})$, $(Y^{-,i,n}, Z^{-,i,n}, K^{-,i,n})$ that we will show converge to the minimal solution of (4.1). Consider the following system of BSDEs defined recursively, for $i = 1, 2$, $n \geq 0$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$, as follows:

Start with the following standard BSDE:

$$\begin{cases} (Y^{+,i,0},\ Z^{+,i,0}) \in \mathcal{S}_c^2 \times \mathcal{M}^{d,2}, \\ Y_t^{+,i,0} = \xi_i^+ + \int_t^T \psi_i^+(s, Y_s^{+,i,0}, Z_s^{+,i,0})ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{+,i,0} dB_s, \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

and denote

$$\begin{aligned} &L_t^i := Y_t^{+,i,0} + b_i(t),\ \ Z_t^i := Z_t^{+,i,0} + V_i(t), \\ &\psi_i(t, L_t^i, Z_t^i) := \psi_i^+(t, L_t^i - b_i(t), Z_t^i - V_i(t)) - U_i(t). \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

In view of (**A1**)-(**A4**), the process $(L^i, Z^i) \in \mathcal{S}_c^2 \times \mathcal{M}^{d,2}$ is the unique solution of the BSDE

$$L_t^i = L_T^i + \int_t^T \psi_i(s, L_s^i, Z_s^i)ds - \int_t^T Z_s^i dB_s. \tag{5.3}$$

Let $(\dot{Y}, \dot{Z})$ be the unique solution of the BSDE:

$$\dot{Y}_t = \dot{Y}_T + \int_t^T \alpha(s, \dot{Y}_s, \dot{Z}_s)ds - \int_t^T \dot{Z}_s dB_s, \tag{5.4}$$

where,

$$\begin{array}{l} \alpha(t,\omega,y,z) := (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2 \wedge \psi_1^- \wedge \psi_2^-)(t,\omega,y,z), \\ \dot{Y}_T := (\xi_1^+ + b_1(T)) \wedge (\xi_2^+ + b_2(T)) \wedge \xi_1^- \wedge \xi_2^-. \end{array} \tag{5.5}$$

By (5.5), the Comparison Theorem yields that

$$\mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \le t \le T, \quad \dot{Y}_t \le L_t^i = Y_t^{+,i,0} + b_i(t), \quad i = 1,2,$$

Hence,

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \le t \le T, \\ \dot{Y}_t \le (Y_t^{+,i,0} + b_i(t)) \wedge (\dot{Y}_t + \ell_i(t)), \quad i = 1,2, \end{array} \tag{5.6}$$

since, $\ell_i(t) > 0$ almost surely.

Consider now, the processes

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (Y^{\pm,i,1},\ Z^{\pm,i,1}, K^{\pm,i,1}) \in \mathcal{S}_c^2 \times \mathcal{M}^{d,2} \times \mathcal{K}_c^2, \\ Y_t^{-,i,1} = \dot{Y}_T + \int_t^T \psi_i^-(s, Y_s^{-,i,1}, Z_s^{-,i,1})ds \\ \qquad\qquad -(K_T^{-,i,1} - K_t^{-,i,1}) - \int_t^T Z_s^{-,i,1} dB_s, \\ Y_t^{-,i,1} \le (Y_t^{+,i,0} + b_i(t)) \wedge (\dot{Y}_t + \ell_i(t)), \\ \int_0^T [(Y_t^{+,i,0} + b_i(t)) \wedge (\dot{Y}_t + \ell_i(t)) - Y_t^{-,i,1}] dK_t^{-,i,1} = 0 \\ Y_t^{+,i,1} = \xi_i^+ + \int_t^T \psi_i^+(s, Y_s^{+,i,1}, Z_s^{+,i,1})ds \\ \qquad\qquad +K_T^{+,i,1} - K_t^{+,i,1} - \int_t^T Z_s^{+,i,1} dB_s, \\ Y_t^{+,1,1} \ge (Y_t^{+,2,0} - \ell_1(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,1,1} - a_1(t)), \\ Y_t^{+,2,1} \ge (Y^{+,1,0} - \ell_2(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,2,1} - a_2(t)), \\ \int_0^T [Y_t^{+,1,1} - (Y_t^{+,2,0} - \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{-,1,1} - a_1(t))] dK_t^{+,1,1} = 0, \\ \int_0^T [Y_t^{+,2,1} - (Y_t^{+,1,0} - \ell_2(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{-,2,1} - a_2(t))] dK_t^{+,2,1} = 0, \end{array} \right. \tag{5.7}$$

and, for $n \geq 1$ and any $t \leq T$, we consider the following system

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^{-,i,n+1} = \xi_i^- + \int_t^T \psi_i^-(s, Y_s^{-,i,n+1}, Z_s^{-,i,n+1})ds \\ \qquad\qquad -(K_T^{-,i,n+1} - K_t^{-,i,n+1}) - \int_t^T Z_s^{-,i,n+1} dB_s, \\ Y_t^{-,1,n+1} \leq (Y_t^{-,2,n} + \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,1,n} + b_1(t)), \\ Y_t^{-,2,n+1} \leq (Y_t^{-,1,n} + \ell_2(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,2,n} + b_2(t)), \\ \int_0^T [(Y_t^{-,2,n} + \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,1,n} + b_1(t)) - Y_t^{-,1,n+1}] dK_t^{-,1,n+1} = 0, \\ \int_0^T [(Y_t^{-,1,n} + \ell_2(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,2,n} + b_2(t)) - Y_t^{-,2,n+1}] dK_t^{-,2,n+1} = 0, \\ Y_t^{+,i,n+1} = \xi_i^+ + \int_t^T \psi_i^+(s, Y_s^{+,i,n+1}, Z_s^{+,i,n+1})ds \\ \qquad\qquad +K_T^{+,i,n+1} - K_t^{+,i,n+1} - \int_t^T Z_s^{+,i,n+1} dB_s, \\ Y_t^{+,1,n+1} \geq (Y_t^{+,2,n} - \ell_1(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,1,n+1} - a_1(t)), \\ Y_t^{+,2,n+1} \geq (Y^{+,1,n} - \ell_2(t)) \vee (Y_t^{-,2,n+1} - a_2(t)), \\ \int_0^T [Y_t^{+,1,n+1} - (Y_t^{+,2,n} - \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{-,1,n+1} - a_1(t))] dK_t^{+,1,n+1} = 0, \\ \int_0^T [Y_t^{+,2,n+1} - (Y_t^{+,1,n} - \ell_2(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{-,2,n+1} - a_2(t))] dK_t^{+,2,n+1} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.8}$$

The processes $(Y^{+,i,0}, Z^{+,i,0})$ being solution of the standard BSDE (5.1) and $(Y^{-,i,1}, Z^{-,i,1}, K^{-,i,1})$ being a solution of a reflected BSDE (5.7), in view of Assumptions (**A1**)-(**A3**), these solutions exist and are unique. It is easily shown by induction that for any $n \geq 1$, the triples $(Y^{+,i,n}, Z^{+,i,n}, K^{+,i,n})$ and $(Y^{-,i,n}, Z^{-,i,n}, K^{-,i,n})$ are well defined and belong to the space $\mathcal{S}_c^2 \times \mathcal{M}^{d,2} \times \mathcal{K}_c^2$. Moreover, by the Comparison Theorem (see Lemma 3.2), we have $\mathbb{P}-$a.s. , for all $0 \leq t \leq T$, $Y_t^{+,i,0} \leq Y_t^{+,i,1}$, since the process $K^{+,i,1}$ is increasing and then $K_T^{+,i,1} - K_t^{+,i,1} \geq 0$ for all $t \leq T$. Moreover, by (5.6) and the Comparison Theorem, we have

$$\mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad \dot{Y}_t \leq Y_t^{-,i,1}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

But, this implies the obvious inequalities

$$(\dot{Y}_t + \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,1,0} + b_1(t)) \leq (Y_t^{-,2,1} + \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,1,1} + b_1(t))$$

and

$$(\dot{Y}_t + \ell_2(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,2,0} + b_2(t)) \leq (Y_t^{-,1,1} + \ell_2(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,2,1} + b_2(t)),$$

$\mathbb{P}-$a.s. , which, in view of the Comparison Theorem, yield that

$$\mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad Y_t^{-,i,1} \leq Y_t^{-,i,2}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Finally, a repeated use of the Comparison Theorem and an induction argument lead to the relation:

$$\text{for all } n \geq 0, \ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.} \ \text{ for all } \ t \leq T,$$
$$Y_t^{+,i,n} \leq Y_t^{+,i,n+1} \ \text{ and } \ Y_t^{-,i,n+1} \leq Y_t^{-,i,n+2}.$$

Step 2. Estimates

In this section we will establish the following uniform (in n) estimate.

Lemma 5.1. *There exists a positive constant C such that, for all $n \geq 1$,*

$$\max_{i=1,2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |Y_t^{i,n}|^2 + \int_0^T |Z_s^{i,n}|^2 ds + (K_T^{i,n})^2\right) \leq C. \tag{5.9}$$

Proof. Consider the following standard BSDE:

$$\begin{cases} \bar{Y} \in \mathcal{S}_c^2 \text{ and } \bar{Z} \in \mathcal{M}^{d,2}, \\ \bar{Y}_t = \sum_{i=1}^2 |\xi_i^-| + \int_t^T \sum_{i=1}^2 |\psi_i^-(s, \bar{Y}_s, \bar{Z}_s)| ds - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s dB_s, \quad t \leq T. \end{cases} \tag{5.10}$$

The solution of this equation exists and the following estimate holds (see [13]).

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\bar{Y}_t|^2 + \int_0^T |\bar{Z}_s|^2 ds\right) \\ &\quad \leq C\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^2 |\psi_i^-(s,0,0)|^2 ds + \sum_{i=1}^2 |\xi_i^-|^2\right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

where, the constant C depending only on the time horizon T and on the Lipschitz constant of ψ_i^-.

Furthermore, since, for $i = 1, 2$, the process $K^{-,i,n}$ is non-decreasing, then, using the Comparison Theorem, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \text{ and all } n, \quad Y_t^{-,i,n} \leq \bar{Y}_t, \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{5.12}$$

Finally, let $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{K})$ be the solution of the following reflected BSDE defined, for any $t \leq T$, as follows

$$\begin{cases} (\tilde{Y}^i, \tilde{Z}^i, \tilde{K}^i) \in \mathcal{S}_c^2 \times \mathcal{M}^{d,2} \times \mathcal{K}_c^2, \ i = 1, 2, \\ \tilde{Y}_t^i = \left|\xi_i^+\right| + \sum_{i=1}^2 \left|\xi_i^-\right| + |a_i(T)| \\ \qquad + \int_t^T \psi_i^+(s, \tilde{Y}_s^i, \tilde{Z}_s^i) ds + (\tilde{K}_T^i - \tilde{K}_t^i) - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^i dB_s, \\ \tilde{Y}_t^i \geq \bar{Y}_t - a_i(t), \\ \int_0^T (\tilde{Y}_s^i - (\bar{Y}_s - a_i(s)) d\tilde{K}_s^i = 0, \end{cases} \tag{5.13}$$

for which, in view of (3.3) and (5.11), there exists a constant C depending only on the time horizon T and on the Lipschitz constant of (ψ_i^+, ψ_i^-), $i = 1, 2$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\tilde{Y}_t^i|^2 + \int_0^T |\tilde{Z}_s^i|^2 ds + |\tilde{K}_T^i|^2\right) \leq CM, \tag{5.14}$$

where,

$$M := \mathbb{E}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\left(|\xi_i^{\pm}|^2 + \int_0^T |\psi_i^{\pm}(s,0,0)|^2 ds + \sup_{0\le t\le T}|a_i(t)|^2\right).$$

Again, since, for each $0 \le t \le T$ and $i = 1, 2$, $\ell_i(t) > 0$, $\tilde{Y}_t^i \ge Y_t^{+,i,0}$ (by the Comparison Theorem) and obviously, $\tilde{Y}_t^i \ge (\tilde{Y}_t^i - \ell_i(t)) \vee (\bar{Y}_t - a_i(t))$, using the Comparison Theorem and relying on (5.12) we have

$$\mathbb{P}-a.s., \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \le t \le T, \quad \text{for all } n, \quad Y_t^{+,i,n} \le \tilde{Y}_t^i,\ i = 1, 2. \quad (5.15)$$

In particular, by (5.12) and (5.15), and using (5.11) and (5.14) and the fact that, for $n \ge 1$, $Y_t^{+,i,0} \le Y_t^{+,i,n}$ and $Y_t^{-,i,1} \le Y_t^{-,i,n}$ a.s., it follows that the process $Y^{i,n} := (Y^{+,i,n}, Y^{-,i,n})$ satisfies

$$\widehat{M} := \max_{i=1,2}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{n\ge 0}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|Y_t^{i,n}|^2\right] < \infty, \qquad i = 1, 2. \quad (5.16)$$

Therefore, in view of (3.3) and (5.16), it holds that, for all $n \ge 0$,

$$\max_{i=1,2}\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\le t\le T}|Y_t^{i,n}|^2 + \int_0^T |Z_s^{i,n}|^2 ds + (K_T^{i,n})^2\right) \le C(M + \widehat{M}). \quad (5.17)$$

which is Estimate (5.9).

∎

Let $Y^{+,i}$ and $Y^{-,i}$, $i = 1, 2$, be two optional processes obtained as $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. increasing limits of $Y^{+,i,n}$ and $Y^{-,i,n}$:

$$Y_t^{+,i} = \lim_{n\to\infty} Y_t^{+,i,n} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_t^{-,i} = \lim_{n\to\infty} Y_t^{-,i,n}, \quad 0 \le t \le T.$$

In the next steps we will show that $Y^{+,i}, Y^{-,i}$, $i = 1, 2$ are in fact continuous and solve the system (4.1). Thanks to Assumption (**A4**), we shall derive the continuity of $Y^{-,i}$, by proving that the associated increasing process $K^{-,i}$ is continuous. This will be done by showing that the measure associated with the continuous increasing process $K^{-,i,n}$ is absolutely continuous w.r.t. dt, with a square integrable density. This is done in the next section.

Step 3. Absolute continuity of the increasing processes $dK^{-,i,n}$

We have the following

Lemma 5.2. *There exists a positive constant C such that, for all $n \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \left(\frac{dK_t^{-,i,n}}{dt}\right)^2 dt\right] \leq C, \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{5.18}$$

Proof. We first establish absolute continuity of $dK_t^{-,i,1}$ w.r.t dt, for each $i = 1, 2$. This together with an induction argument will then yield absolute continuity of $dK_t^{-,i,n}$ w.r.t. dt, for every $n \geq 1$.
Let

$$\mathcal{O}_t^i := L_t^i \wedge (\dot{Y}_t + \ell_i(t)) = L_t^i - (L_t^i - \dot{Y}_t - \ell_i(t))^+, \;\; i = 1, 2.$$

In view of (**A4**) and the Itô-Tanaka formula, we get

$$\mathcal{O}_t^i = \mathcal{O}_0^i + \int_0^t f_i(s)ds + \int_0^t g_i(s)dB_s - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_t^i, \tag{5.19}$$

where, $\mathcal{L}^i$ is the local time at zero of the continuous semimartingale $L^i - \dot{Y} - \ell_i$,

$$f_i(t) := -\psi_i(t, L_t^i, Z_t^i) + \mathbf{1}_{\{L_t^i > \dot{Y}_t + \ell_i(t)\}}\left(\psi_i(t, L_t^i, Z_t^i) - \alpha(t, \dot{Y}_t, \dot{Z}_t) + \bar{U}_i(t)\right)$$

and

$$g_i(t) := Z_t^i - \mathbf{1}_{\{L_t^i > \dot{Y}_t + \ell_i(t)\}}\left(Z_t^i - \dot{Z}_t - \bar{V}_i(t)\right),$$

where, in view (**A1**)-(**A4**) and (5.9), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \left(|\psi_i^-(t, Y_t^{-,i,1}, Z_t^{-,i,1})|^2 + |f_i(t)|^2 + |g_i(t)|^2\right) dt\right] \leq C, \qquad i = 1, 2. \tag{5.20}$$

Following the proof of Proposition 4.2 in ([13]), we obtain

$$0 \leq dK_t^{-,i,1} \leq \left(|\psi_i^-(t, Y^{-,i,1}, Z^{-,i,1})| + |f_i(t)|\right) dt, \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{5.21}$$

which together with (5.20) yield that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \left(\frac{dK_t^{-,i,1}}{dt}\right)^2 dt\right] \leq C, \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{5.22}$$

By induction, assuming $K_t^{-,i,n}$ satisfies the estimate (5.22), we will show that $K_t^{-,i,n+1}$ satisfies a similar estimate. We will only consider the case $i = 1$, as the other case follows in a similar fashion.

Consider the obstacle process

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}_t^n :=&(Y_t^{-,2,n} + \ell_1(t)) \wedge (Y_t^{+,1,n} + b_1(t)) \\ =&Y_t^{+,1,n} + b_1(t) - (Y_t^{+,1,n} + b_1(t) - Y_t^{-,2,n} - \ell_1(t))^+.\end{aligned}$$

By (**A4**) and the Itô-Tanaka formula, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}_t^n = \mathcal{O}_0^n + \int_0^t f_n(s)ds + \int_0^t g_n(s)dB_s \\ - \frac{1}{2}d\mathcal{L}_t^n - \mathbf{1}_{\{\{Y_t^{+,1,n}+b_1(t)\le Y_t^{-,2,n}+\ell_1(t)\}\}}dK_t^{+,1,n},\end{aligned}$$

where, $\mathcal{L}^n$ is the local time at zero of the continuous semimartingale $Y^{+,1,n} + b_1 - Y^{-,2,n} - \ell_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}f_n(t) :=&U_1(t) - \psi_1^+(t, Y_t^{+,1,n}, Z_t^{+,1,n}) \\ &- \mathbf{1}_{\{Y^{+,1,n}(t)+b_1(t)>Y^{-,2,n}(t)+\ell_1(t)\}}\bigg(U_1(t) - \psi_1^+(t, Y_t^{+,1,n}, Z_t^{+,1,n}) \\ &+ \psi_2^-(Y_t^{-,2,n}, Z_t^{-,2,n}) - \bar{U}_1(t) - \frac{dK_t^{-,2,n}}{dt}\bigg),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}g_n(t) :=&Z_t^{+,1,n} + V_1(t) \\ &- \mathbf{1}_{\{Y^{+,1,n}(t)+b_1(t)>Y^{-,2,n}(t)+\ell_1(t)\}}\big(Z_t^{+,1,n} + V_1(t) - Z_t^{-,2,n} - \bar{V}_1(t)\big),\end{aligned}$$

where, in view (**A1**)-(**A4**), (5.9) and that $K_t^{-,i,n}$ satisfies (5.22), there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of n such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \left(|\psi_i^-(t, Y^{-,1,n+1}, Z^{-,1,n+1})|^2 + |f_n(t)|^2 + |g_n(t)|^2\right) dt\right] \le C. \quad (5.23)$$

Again, following the proof of Proposition 4.2 in ([13]), we obtain

$$0 \le dK_t^{-,1,n+1} \le \left(|\psi_i^-(t, Y^{-,1,n+1}, Z^{-,1,n+1})| + |f_n(t)|\right) dt, \quad (5.24)$$

which together with (5.23) yield that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \left(\frac{dK_t^{-,1,n+1}}{dt}\right)^2 dt\right] \leq C.$$

∎

References

[1] Arnarson, T., Djehiche, B., Poghosyan, M., and Shahgholian, H. A pde approach to regularity of solutions to finite horizon optimal switching problems. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications 71*, 12 (2009), 6054–6067.

[2] Carmona, R., and Ludkovski, M. Valuation of energy storage: An optimal switching approach. *Quantitative Finance 10*, 4 (2010), 359–374.

[3] Chassagneux, J.-F., Elie, R., Kharroubi, I., et al. A note on existence and uniqueness for solutions of multidimensional reflected bsdes. *Electronic Communications in Probability 16* (2011), 120–128.

[4] Chassagneux, J.-F., Elie, R., Kharroubi, I., et al. Discrete-time approximation of multidimensional bsdes with oblique reflections. *The Annals of Applied Probability 22*, 3 (2012), 971–1007.

[5] Cvitanic, J., and Karatzas, I. Backward stochastic differential equations with reflection and Dynkin games. *Ann. Probab. 24*, 4 (1995), 2024–2056.

[6] Dellacherie, C., and Meyer, P. *Probabilités and potentiels, Chapter I-IV*. Hermann, Paris, 1975.

[7] Dixit, A. K., and Pindyck, R. S. *Investment under Uncertainty*. Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1994.

[8] Djehiche, B., and Hamadène, S. On a finite horizon starting and stopping problem with risk of abandonment. *Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finance 12*, 4 (2009), 523–543.

[9] Djehiche, B., Hamadène, S., and Morlais, M. A. Optimal stopping of expected profit and cost yields in an investment under uncertainty. *Stochastics 83*, 4-6 (2011), 431–448.

[10] Djehiche, B., Hamadène, S., and Popier, A. A Finite Horizon Optimal Multiple Switching Problem. *SIAM J. Control Optim. 48*, 4 (2009), 2751–2770.

[11] Djehiche, B., and Hamdi, A. A two-mode mean-field optimal switching problem for the full balance sheet. *International Journal of Stochastic Analysis 2014* (2014).

[12] El Asri, B., and Hamadene, S. The finite horizon optimal multimodes switching problem: the viscosity solution approach. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization 60*, 2 (2009), 213–235.

[13] El Karoui, N., Kapoudjan, C., Pardoux, E., Peng, S., and Quenez, M.-C. Reflected solutions of backward SDE and related problems for PDE's. *Ann. Probab. 25*, 2 (1997), 702–737.

[14] Elie, R., and Kharroubi, I. Probabilistic representation and approximation for coupled systems of variational inequalities. *Statistics & probability letters 80*, 17 (2010), 1388–1396.

[15] Hamadène, S. Reflected bsde's with discontinuous barrier and application. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes 74*, 3-4 (2002), 571–596.

[16] Hamadène, S., and Jeanblanc, M. On the Starting and Stopping Problem: Application in Reversible investments. *Math. Oper. Res. 32*, 1 (2007), 182–192.

[17] Hamadène, S., and Morlais, M. Viscosity solutions of systems of pdes with interconnected obstacles and switching problem. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization 67*, 2 (2013), 163–196.

[18] Hamadène, S., and Zhang, J. Switching problems and related systems of reflected backward SDEs. *Stochastic Process. Appl. 74* (2010), 571–596.

[19] Hu, Y., and Tang, S. Switching game of backward stochastic differential equations and associated system of obliquely reflected backward stochastic differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0806.2058* (2008).

[20] Hu, Y., and Tang, S. Multi-dimensional bsde with oblique reflection and optimal switching. *Probability Theory and Related Fields 147*, 1-2 (2010), 89–121.

[21] Johnson, T. C., and Zervos, M. The explicit solution to a sequential switching problem with non-smooth data. *Stochastics An International Journal of Probability and Stochastics Processes 82*, 1 (2010), 69–109.

[22] Karatzas, I., and Shreve, S. E. *Methods of Mathematical Finance*. Springer, New York, 1998.

[23] Lepeltier, J. P., and Xu, M. Penalization method for reflected backward stochastic differential equations with one r.c.l.l. barrier. *Statist. Probab. Lett. 75* (2005), 58–66.

[24] Li, K., Nyström, K., and Olofsson, M. Optimal switching problems under partial information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.1795* (2014).

[25] Ludkovski, M. Stochastic switching games and duopolistic competition in emissions markets. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics 2*, 1 (2011), 488–511.

[26] Lundström, N. L., Nyström, K., and Olofsson, M. Systems of variational inequalities for non-local operators related to optimal switching problems: existence and uniqueness. *Manuscripta Mathematica* (2013), 1–26.

[27] Lundström, N. L., Nyström, K., and Olofsson, M. Systems of variational inequalities in the context of optimal switching problems and operators of kolmogorov type. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata* (2013), 1–35.

[28] Peng, S. Monotonic limit theorem of BSDE and nonlinear decomposition theorem of Doob-Meyer's type. *Probab. Theory Related Fields 113* (1999), 473–499.

[29] Peng, S., and Xu, M. The smallest g-supermartingale and reflected BSDE with single and double L^2 obstacles. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. 41*, 3 (2005), 605–630.

[30] Perninge, M., and Söder, L. Irreversible investments with delayed reaction: an application to generation re-dispatch in power system operation. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research 79*, 2 (2014), 195–224.

[31] Pham, H., Vath, V. L., and Zhou, X. Y. Optimal switching over multiple regimes. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 48*, 4 (2009), 2217–2253.

[32] Revuz, D., and Yor, M. *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion*. Springer, New York, 2005.

[33] Trigeorgis, L. *Real options: managerial flexibility and strategy in resource allocation*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1996.

[34] Vath, V. L., Pham, H., Villeneuve, S., et al. A mixed singular/switching control problem for a dividend policy with reversible technology investment. *The Annals of Applied Probability 18*, 3 (2008), 1164–1200.

[35] Zervos, M. A problem of sequential entry and exit decisions combined with discretionary stopping. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 42*, 2 (2003), 397–421.